

Appl. No. 10/071,504
Amdt. Dated February 4, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2003

REMARKS

Claims Rejections

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection

The Examiner takes the position that claims 1, 11, 23, 26 and 29 are unpatentable over Harada et al. Claims 1, 11, 23, 26 and 29 have been canceled.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The Examiner takes the position that claims 12-14, 17, 21-22 and 30-34 are unpatentable in view of Harada et al in light of Suzuki et al and Barnett et al. Claims 12-14, 17, 21-22 and 30-34 have been canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2-8, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are allowable. In addition, the Examiner has suggested replacing "patter" with "pattern" in each of claims 24, 25, 27 and 28. Claims 24 and 25 have been so amended. Claims 27 and 28 do not appear to have the term "pattern", so no amendments were necessary. As Claim 1 has been canceled, Claim 25 has also been amended to delete the reference to Claim 1 and is treated as an independent claim.


Appl. No. 10/071,504
Amdt. Dated February 4, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2003

CONCLUSION

The Applicant therefore submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Date: February 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Smith (Registration No. 35,777)
Paul Smith Intellectual Property Law
330 – 1508 West Broadway
Vancouver, British Columbia V6J 1W8,
CANADA
Tel: 604-689-7276 Fax: 604-689-7216

Attorney for the Applicants
Bill Christensen and Jeff Gruending

069P2.tcs2

Appl. No. 10/071,504
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2003-07-11
Reply to Office Action of March 12, 2003

REMARKS

Election/Restriction

The applicant affirms the election to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-17 and 20-22. Accordingly, claims 18 and 19 have been withdrawn as the result of the restriction requirement, however, the applicant retains the right to present claims 18 and 19 in a divisional application.

Claims Rejections

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 9, 10, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being unclear, apparently because they are method claims that depend from assembly claims. The applicant submits that this is in fact acceptable practice and that these claims are not unclear as a result. The claims simply define methods that are practiced using specific assemblies defined in the claims that are referred to. Nonetheless, in order to clarify, each of claims 9, 10, 15 and 16 have been cancelled. New claims 23-34 have been added so as to directly incorporate the subject matter of the referred to claims. No new matter is added and the amendments as made should not be taken as any form of limitation to the scope of the claims before amendment.

It is submitted that the claims as amended comply with 35 U.S.C. 112.